

### **REMARKS**

This is responsive to the Office Action made final and mailed on July 23, 2007. In that Office Action, claims 1,2,4-8,17,18 and 20-24 stand rejected. With this amendment, independent claims 1 and 17 have been amended. The application continues to include claims 1,2,4-8,17,18 and 20-24.

Entry of this amendment is respectfully requested under 37 C.F.R. 1.116 (b). It is believed that the amendment to the claims places the application in condition for allowance in view of the remarks in this Office Action. No new matter is being added and it is believed no additional search is necessary. Alternatively, the amendment places the application in better form for consideration on appeal. Support for the amendment of claims 1 and 17 is found in the specification on page 5, lines 22-27.

The amendment to the claims is the result of comments in the Office Action on pages 6 and 7. The comments state that applicant's arguments regarding that Cox, Jr. fails to teach that the fluid goes back and forth into the thin plastic liner bag was found to be non-persuasive since it was not commensurate in scope with the claim language. Specifically, the Office Action alleged that the claim language did not require flow of the coating solution back "into" the deformable coating supply container but merely defined the fluid flow as "between" the coating chamber and the deformable coating solution supply container. This is the first time that applicant has been informed that the claim language does not positively recite that the coating solution flows back into the coating solution supply container. Applicant had previously asserted this point in responding to a similar issue raised in a previous Office Action, the Response being entered on May 12, 2006. In that response on page 3, applicant stated "having the coating solution flow back to the supply container to preserve the coating solution for future coatings is important protecting the coating solution." This comment was made in view of a combination of references utilizing the Ferri, Jr. Patent for rejecting the claims. There was no allegation at that time that such statement was not commensurate in scope with the claim language. (Why else would the fluid flow back and forth between two containers unless fluid would be flowing into and out of both containers). If this allegation had been made in the previous Office Action,

applicant would have amended claims 1 and 17 in the manner being amended herein. Therefore, it is believed that the entry of this amendment would be appropriate under 37 C.F.R. 1.116(b).

The arguments which Applicant presented in the prior Office Action mailed on March 15, 2007 are hereby incorporated by reference and specifically that there is no teaching or suggestion that a liquid can be withdrawn back into the liner bag of Cox, Jr., let alone having the solution go back and forth without the minor vibrations described in Ruuttu et al. Furthermore, the Cox, Jr. reference does not teach or suggest that the plastic liner bag can be attached to another container from which the solutions can be exchanged back and forth in a manner amenable to coating a work piece.

In view of the above, and in view of independent claims 1 and 17 having been amended, it is believed that claims 1 and 17, and their respective claims, are now in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance of claims 1 and 17, and their respective dependent claims are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date

8/15/2007

By:

Kent S. Kokko, Reg. No.: 33,931  
Telephone No.: 651-733-3597

Office of Intellectual Property Counsel  
3M Innovative Properties Company  
Facsimile No.: 651-736-3833